

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4, 5-7, 9-12, 15-19, 21-39, 41-47, 49-55, 57-77 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 12, 16, 24, 28, 36, 44, and 52 were amended. Consequently, claims 1, 4, 5-7, 9-12, 15-19, 21-39, 41-47, 49-55, 57-77 remain pending.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview held on January 7, 2005. Issues discussed included a Form 1449 in an IDS submitted August 17, 2004 that was missing from Applicant's file, and the prior art references of Rosen, Black, and Shoji and their disclosures with respect to the rejections of the claims. No agreement was reached on the issues discussed.

Applicant appears to be missing a second sheet from the Examiner's signed/initialed copy of the Form 1449 submitted August 17, 2004, in which the Examiner signed the Form 1449 and initialed the references listed on the form. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner include another copy of the signed/initialed Form 1449 for Applicant's records.

Applicant notifies the Examiner that in copending related patent application 09/585,231, filed May 30, 2000, the Examiner for that application rejected the pending claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-30, and 51-58 in that application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Martin Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,419), in view of Goodman (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,929); rejected claims 3, 11, 19, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Martin Jr., Goodman, and Hancock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,023); and rejected claims 8, 16, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under Martin Jr., Goodman, and Giangarra et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,472).

The 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7, 9-10, 12, 15-16, 19, 21-22, 24, 28, 31, 33-34, 36, 39, 41-42, 44, 47, 49-50, 52, 55, and 57-58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen et al. (U.S. 6,014, 090) in view of Shoji et al. (U.S. 6,564, 254) and further in view of Black et al. (U.S. 6,654,813). Claims 5, 17, 29, 37, 45, and 53 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-Shoji-Black in view of Martin Jr. et al. (U.S. 6,363,419). Claims 6, 18, 30, 38, 46 and 54 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-Shoji-Black in view of Wynblatt et al. (U.S. 6,219,696). Claims 11, 23, 35, 43, 51 and 59 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-Shoji-Black in view of Perrone et al. (U.S. 6,157,705). Applicant respectfully disagrees as set forth below.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52 to clarify that the server queries the database using the environment information from the wireless device to determine particular web sites most likely to be requested by a user of the wireless device in the environment of the wireless device, wherein the particular web sites are determined by examining prior patterns of access of web sites in the environment of the wireless device by users of the communication network. This is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 7, lines 6-10, and page 9, lines 8-22. Applicant has also amended these claims to remove step (d), which Applicant believes is patentable, but now recites the feature in new dependent claims 60, 65, 68, 72, 74, and 76. Accordingly, no new matter has been submitted.

Rosen, Black, and Shoji do not disclose or suggest receiving particular web site identifiers that have been identified based on prior patterns of access of web sites from the particular environment of the user and device. Rosen discloses matching a provided geographic location identifier with resource servers by using the location identifier as a keyword in a query

of association data that corresponds to resource servers (col. 5, lines 28-34). There is nothing disclosed or suggested in Rosen about examining prior patterns of access of web sites by users in the environment of the device to determine web site identifiers. Similarly, Black discloses that entities can be searched in a database using a hierarchical menu and a location filter. Database elements are filtered by simply matching a query to the “physical location” fields of the database elements (col. 5, lines 46-64; Fig. 8). In Black, there is no determination of search results based on examining prior patterns of access by users who were in the particular environment of the device. Rosen and Black perform simple searches using keywords and fields. Thus, for example, the systems of Rosen and Black cannot find data that may be relevant to a user at a particular location unless there is a preexisting association of the data with the location.

Applicant's invention can examine prior patterns of access from the environment to help provide relevant web site identifiers for that environment which cannot be found by the systems disclosed in these references or any combination thereof. Shoji also does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is patentable over Rosen in view of Black and Shoji. Independent claims 12 and 24 recite similar features and are believed patentable over Rosen, Black, and Shoji for at least similar reasons.

Independent claims 36, 44, and 52 similarly recite receiving identifiers from a server that queries the database using geographical location, local weather, time and/or date to determine particular web sites most likely to be requested by a user of the wireless device in the environment of the wireless device, where the particular web sites are determined by examining prior patterns of access of web sites in the environment of the wireless device by users of the communication network, and are therefore believed similarly patentable over Rosen, Black, and Shoji for the reasons stated above. These claims have been amended to recite that the database is

categorized by type of environments, as described in the specification on page 9, lines 1-7.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not teach or suggest the combination of features and limitations recited in the independent claims. In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, the dependent claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 15-19, 21-24, 28-31, 33-39, 41-47, 49-55, 57-59 as now presented.

Claims 60-77 have been added by this amendment and are dependent on the independent claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as explained above. Claims 60, 65, 68, 72, 74, and 76 recite a lookahead data entry feature that was previously recited in the independent claims. Claim 61 recites that the web site identifiers of the database are categorized according to types of environments, as described in the specification on page 9, lines 1-7. Claims 62 and 69 recite that the web site identifiers are augmented with identifiers for web sites accessed from an environment similar to the device environment, which is described in the specification on page 9, lines 12-13 and Fig. 4. Claims 63, 66, and 70 recite that the web sites most likely to be requested are most frequently requested by users in the device environment, which is described in the specification on page 7, lines 6-9 and page 9, lines 9-10. Claims 64, 67, 71, 73, 75, and 77 recite that the server collects information from a service provider and analyzes it for patterns of use for each environment, the information indicating which web sites have been accessed from which environments by wireless devices, and is described in the specification on page 9, lines 1-7. Accordingly, no new matter has been submitted. None of these features is disclosed or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner, and these claims are believed patentable over the references cited by the

Examiner.

Applicants' attorney believes that this Application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 493-4540

January 19, 2005